

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/774,986	Applicant(s) GUT ET AL.	
	Examiner Hau H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2676	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew Bella (PTO).

(3) Jason Vick (Representative).

(2) Hau Nguyen(PTO).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 October 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Melen et al (6,631,205)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See below

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Discussed the background of the invention. The Examiner agreed that claim 1 overcomes the Melen et al (6,631,205) reference.

Matthew Bella

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required